



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,585	12/29/2000	Eric T. Lambert	YOR920000560US1/127-0005	8383

7590 05/22/2003

Philmore H. Colburn II
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002

EXAMINER

JAKETIC, BRYAN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/751,585

Applicant(s)

LAMBERT ET AL.

Examiner

Bryan Jaketic

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 13 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claims 13 and 33 each recite the limitation "said list" in line 2 of each claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3, 13, 14, 19, 21-23, 33, 34, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aycock et al. Aycock et al disclose a method for facilitating part qualification comprising the steps of: receiving at a host supplier system a request by a remote user system to execute part qualification software (see col. 9, lines 22-36 and col. 12, lines 37-56); executing the software (Fig. 3, see col. 12, line 37 through col. 13, line 12); providing the user with output by sending results to the user

system (18); and receiving input at the host system in response to the execution (36, 38, 40).

Regarding claims 2 and 22, Aycock et al disclose the steps of selecting a commodity type and creating a part qualification plan based on a part qualification plan template (see col. 5, lines 44-65); updating the part qualification plan with data specific to the supplier part (see col. 5, line 44 through col. 6, line 36); analyzing the data (20); and qualifying the supplier part based on the analysis (22, 24, 26, and 32).

Regarding claims 3 and 23, Aycock et al disclose the use of an archiving tool (62) for the part qualification plan.

Regarding claims 13 and 33, Aycock et al teach that each item is weighted and analyzed. It is therefore inherent that each item is viewed.

Regarding claims 14 and 34, Aycock et al teach the step of running reports against detailed plans and viewing said reports (col. 8, lines 19-38 and col. 9, lines 37-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4-12, 15-18, 20, 24-32, and 35-38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aycock et al. Aycock et al disclose a qualification plan

Art Unit: 3627

template comprising types of data required (see col. 5, lines 44-65); proposed remote data repositories (62); and a text message field (Fig. 6). Aycock et al do not disclose a default viewing tool based on the proposed data repositories. However, it is inherent that a default viewing tool be used to view the stored data. Aycock et al also fail to disclose an access permission structure or restricting access to supplier data.

However, permission structures are common in the art, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a permission structure with the invention of Aycock et al to prevent unauthorized access to sensitive information.

Aycock et al further disclose a template comprising a detailed plan framework comprising a plurality of tasks (a plurality of questions - see col. 6, line 55 through col. 7, line 13) assigned to one entity (see col. 15, lines 1-12). Aycock et al do not teach a suggested duration or target date for each task. However, it is common in the art to set deadlines for tasks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ suggested durations or target date of each task with the invention of Aycock to ensure the evaluation is performed in a timely manner.

Aycock et al further disclose a text message field that includes a document link (212); a hypertext link (210d, 210e, and 210f); a file name (212b); and a comment (210b).

Aycock et al do not disclose a firewall in communication with the host system. However, firewalls are common in the art, and it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3627

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a firewall with the invention of Aycock et al as a security measure.

Aycock fails to disclose the use of a web server, an applications server, and a database server. However, Aycock teaches that the disclosed embodiment may be modified to employ multiple servers for performing tasks (col. 15, lines 29-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a web server, an applications server, and a database server with the invention of Aycock et al to perform each specialized function.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Borgstahl et al, Aggarwal et al, and Zawadzki et al disclose methods for determining compatibility. Knowlton et al, Newman et al, Dunphy et al, and Kuribayashi et al disclose systems for storing compatibility information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan Jaketic whose telephone number is (703) 308-0134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cuff can be reached on (703) 308-0610. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/751,585

Page 6

Art Unit: 3627

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

bj
May 20, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom J. Miller", is written over the typed name.